

Message

From: Mylott, Richard [Mylott.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/8/2020 12:08:21 AM
To: Partridge, Charles [Partridge.Charles@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Quote

Roger.

From: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 5:08 PM
To: Mylott, Richard <Mylott.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Quote

Yeah it this it's best coming from you guys. I have been in the press enough and don't want it to look like it's just me piling on these researchers.

Cp

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 7, 2020, at 5:06 PM, Mylott, Richard <Mylott.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:

Thanks, cant wait! You prefer this coming from Andrew or me and not you?

From: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 5:03 PM
To: Mylott, Richard <Mylott.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Mutter, Andrew <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>; Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Quote

Very good. I'll make you a scientist in no time.

Cp

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 7, 2020, at 4:59 PM, Mylott, Richard <Mylott.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:

Are you ok with this for Matt Vincent as well?

.....

I'm not sure there's much more to be said about our review. We've spent a good deal of time consulting with ATSDR and the authors of other studies in evaluating the scientific literature on meconium. The analysis of this science and the determination of the Butte data as generally consistent with the literature, and the South Carolina data as extremely anomalous, is a fairly straightforward conclusion.

From: Mutter, Andrew <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>

Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 4:17 PM

To: Mylott, Richard <Mylott.Richard@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: Quote

Additional request

Best regards,

Andrew

Andrew Mutter

Director, Public Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 (Denver, CO)

Office: 303.312.6448

Cell: 720.520.3047

Twitter: [@EPARegion8](https://twitter.com/EPARegion8)

Facebook: [U.S. EPA Region 8](https://www.facebook.com/USEPARegion8)

Webpage: [EPA Region 8](https://www.epa.gov/region8) (Mountains and Plains)

<image003.jpg>

From: Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>

Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 3:49 PM

To: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>; Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>

Cc: Mutter, Andrew <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: Quote

Also, could you make a comment on EPA/ATSDR's process that led to this evaluation and how it compares in your opinion, to a "peer review"? I guess where I'm going with this is that it appears as if EPA/ATSDR conducted its own "peer review" of the McDermott data and findings, but, the only review McDermott et al are willing to cooperate with is one with peers who agree with them.

On Fri, Feb 7, 2020 at 1:59 PM Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com> wrote:

Gentlemen,

Can you provide me a quote from one or both of you that explains the importance of getting the journal to recall McDermott et al's publication? Also, it would be helpful if you can explain the frequency with which this kind of request takes place in journals.

E.g. how often do publications get pulled, so to speak? On the second part of my request, I won't attribute it to you in the story, just wanting to provide for some more context on how often that kind of action takes place in the research world.

If you can get the quote and any info on the contextual item to me by sometime tomorrow that would be soon enough.

Thanks!

Matt

Sent from my iPhone